



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,754	12/21/2000	Randall G. Smith	POLY 8	1016

6980 7590 01/02/2003

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA, SUITE 5200
600 PEACHTREE STREET, NE
ATLANTA, GA 30308-2216

EXAMINER

BHAT, ADITYA S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2863

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/746,754

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Aditya S Bhat

Art Unit

2863

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,9,10 and 17-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,9,10 and 17-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9-10 and 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114) in view of Kitada (Japanese PN # JP02000355188A).

Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114) teaches a method for calibrating positions between a location sensing electronic device and an electronic device coupled to a display device or a personal computer comprising of projecting an image onto a surface of a location sensing electronic device (See Figure # 1), detecting a touch at a predefined calibration point (44; Col. 5 Lines 57-60), calculating a relationship between the predefined calibration point comprises detecting selection of an actual button on the surface of the location sensing electronic device (See Figure # 1), detecting a touch at a predefined calibration point comprises detecting selection of an actual button on an exterior frame of the location sensing electronic device (20; Col. 3 Lines 52-56), a system for calibrating positions between the surface of a location sensing electronic device and a display device coupled to an electronic device comprising of a location sensing electronic device comprising a location sensing surface and an exterior frame (See Figure # 1), location device is programmed to calibrate positions between the

Art Unit: 2863

surface of a location sensing electronic device and the display of an electronic device (Col.6, Lines 39-58), wherein the predefined location is a projected button on the surface of the location sensing device (See Figure # 1), wherein the predefined location is an actual button on the surface of the location sensing device and on the exterior frame of the location sensing device (20; Col. 3 Lines 52-56). a system for calibrating positions between the surface of an electronic whiteboard and the monitor of a personal computer comprising of an electronic whiteboard comprising a touch sensitive surface and an exterior frame (Col.6 Lines 39-60), , a monitor and the electronic whiteboard coupled to the personal computer (Col.3 Lines 13-16), and an electronic whiteboard comprising of a touch sensitive surface and an exterior frame (See figure # 1, 44; Col.5 line 58-61).

Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114) does not appear to teach projection device (projector), and a personal computer coupled to an electronic whiteboard device.

Although, Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114) does not appear to teach a projection device and coupling it to a computer as well as the electronic whiteboard device in order to project an image. It would be obvious to connect a projector to the computer and the electronic whiteboard device in order to display the any data that has been written on the whiteboard. It is well known in the art to couple these devices as many professors at Universities use this technique to assist in their lectures.

Kitada (Japanese PN # JP02000355188A) teaches a projection system coupled to a whiteboard and a PC.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114) with Kitada (Japanese PN # JP02000355188A) in order to project the images that appear on the whiteboard.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8 October 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the calibration process is done distant from the computer and the prior art of record does not disclose such an apparatus, which is capable of calibration at the whiteboard rather than at the computer.

Geaghan et al. (USPN 5,790,114) shows a touch screen containing the same menu as the one displayed on the computer, and also a button region for inputting commands. Therefore, it would be obvious for a user of Geaghan's invention to initiate calibration at the whiteboard itself as opposed to doing it at the computer.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Elrod et al (USPN 5,495,269) teaches a large area electronic writing system, and Vogeley et al. (USPN 5,422,693) teaches a method and apparatus for interacting with a computer generated projected image.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2863


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aditya S Bhat whose telephone number is 703-308-0332. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on 703-308-3126. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-5841 for regular communications and 703-308-5841 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Aditya S. Bhat
December 24, 2002


John Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800